



**Re: Hanford GW monitoring**   
**Dave Bartus** to: Adam Baron

03/03/2012 11:47 AM

Based on Cheryl's input, we apparently have \$10k of contractor funds available, so presumably we'd be doing this through the REPA contract. I'd love to have our OEA folks to the inspection, but they've been pretty resistant to taking on RCRA GW or inspection work. Too bad, since they would be an excellent resource to tap into.

Dave

Adam Baron

[Who you thinking would do this? Contractors or...](#)

03/02/2012 09:29:07 AM

From: Adam Baron/R10/USEPA/US  
To: Dave Bartus/R10/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 03/02/2012 09:29 AM  
Subject: Re: Hanford GW monitoring

Who you thinking would do this? Contractors or someone around here?

Adam Baron  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
U.S. EPA, Region 10 (OCE-127)  
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900  
Seattle, WA 98101  
(206) 553-6361  
baron.adam@epa.gov

Dave Bartus

[Rick: Earlier this week, I floated a proposal to co...](#)

03/02/2012 07:46:38 AM

From: Dave Bartus/R10/USEPA/US  
To: albright.rick@epa.gov  
Cc: Adam Baron/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Jack Boller/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, CherylB Williams/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Jeff Kenknight/R10/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 03/02/2012 07:46 AM  
Subject: Hanford GW monitoring

Rick: Earlier this week, I floated a proposal to consider conducting a Comprehensive Monitoring Evaluation (CME) groundwater monitoring inspection focusing on Hanford's two mixed waste trenches. As you may recall, when NEIC performed its inspection last year, they inspected the two disposal units, but specifically excluded groundwater monitoring from the scope of the inspection. To the best of my knowledge, neither Ecology nor EPA has ever performed a groundwater monitoring inspection at these two units. The purpose of the two inspections is to provide an independent, objective analysis of the adequacy of the design and operation of current and proposed GW monitoring programs, and we would use the results both for our traditional compliance program, and to support our oversight review of the re-issue permit. I believe that this proposal is consistent with both our existing federal facility inspection policies, and our commitment to have an on-going compliance presence at Hanford.

Cheryl, performing her usual magic, has identified \$10k of contractor funds that we could use for this inspection. My understanding is that we need to make a decision whether to make use of these funds by mid-next week. What I would like is feedback as to whether you see any significant objection to performing this inspection. We have not developed any of the specific details of the inspection, so I'm looking at the question only from a high-level management policy and strategy perspective.

Thoughts from others for Rick to consider?

Dave